DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 682 UD 017 232

AUTHOR Herr, Audrey
TITLE Program for Institutionalized Children.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 95p.; N.Y.C. Bd. of Ed. Function No. 09-71636

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; *Delinquents; *Institutionalized Persons; *Mathematics; Problem Children; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Reading Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The Program for Institutionalized Children in New York City provided reading and/or mathematics instruction for 624 Title I eligible pupils in grades one through twelve in 12 institutions for neglected, abused, or delinquent children. The program operated for seven weeks with approximately 15 hours of instruction weekly. Small group instruction or individual tutoring was provided by 80 teachers assisted by 12 paraprofessionals and three student aids under the supervision of eight teachers-in-charge. All students were given entry and mastery tests with standardized criterion-referenced tests from the Croft reading system and/or from the Base mathematics system. The major evaluation objective of having 70% of the participants demonstrate mastery of at least two instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics was achieved. In reading, 75% of the pupils achieved mastery of at least two objectives as a result of instruction. In mathematics, 86% of the pupils mastered at least two objectives as a result of instruction. Sixty-eight percent of the pupils demonstrated mastery of more than 70% of the instructional objectives they attempted in both subject areas. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142682

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-71636-50
School District 75

PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN

July 1, 1976 to August 31, 1976

Prepared by

AUDREY HERR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD0 17232

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-76 school year.

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ii
Chapter	
I. THE PROGRAM	1
II. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	4
Evaluative Objectives	4
Observation of the Program	5
III. FINDINGS	6
IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
APPENDIX	
A. Program Abstract	18
B. Table 13 MIR Form	19
C. O.E.E. Data Loss Form	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Selected Reading Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction	7
2.	Distribution of the Number of Reading Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction	8
3.	Distribution of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Reading Instructional Objectives	9
4.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Selected Mathematics Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction	10
5.	Distribution of the Number of Mathematics Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction	11
6.	Distribution of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Mathematics Instructional Objectives	12

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

This program was designed to serve children at institutions for the neglected, dependent, and/or delinquent who were in need of an extended school year program. The stated purpose of the program was to improve the basic reading and/or mathematics skills of the participants.

The program was in operation from July 1 to August 31, 1976 at 12 institutions in the five boroughs of New York City. Nine of these agencies were for abused and neglected children:

Catholic Guardian Society

Childville, Inc.

Hegeman Diagnostic Center

Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Home

Mercy Home for Children

Q.S.P.C.C.

St. John's Home for Boys

St. Michael's Services for Children

Three institutions were for juvenile delinquents:

Pius XII

St. Germaine Group Home

Spofford Juvenile Center

There were 624 Title I eligible pupils participating, 84 of whom were discharged during the course of the program. All of the participants were identified by the teachers and/or guidance counselors of the regular school year programs as requiring remediation in reading and/or math.

There were some instances, at group homes particularly, where eligible students requested that they be admitted to the program.

Individual proposals were developed by Title I personnel in consultation with individual institution personnel. Most of the programs operated from 9 A.M. to 12 noon, four days per week. The average instructional time allotment was 15 hours per week for seven weeks.

The program's objective was to help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics which they failed prior to instruction as measured by the CROFT (Reading) and BASE (Mathematics) criterion referenced tests. Specific instructional objectives were selected for reading (nine objectives) and mathematics (10 objectives) in the proposal.

During the first week of the program all students were given the appropriate level criterion referenced tests in reading and/or math. (Two institutions had only reading or math programs.) The last week of the program participants were retested on those tests which they failed prior to instruction. Thus a pre/post test model was utilized. Staff members recorded the test results in the pass/fail mode by pupil and instructional objective on the Class Evaluation Record (CER) provided by the Office of Educational Evaluation.

Small group and individualized instruction directed toward remediation of the identified specific reading and/or mathematics needs of each pupil was conducted by 80 teachers assisted by 12 paraprofessionals and three student aides under the supervision of eight teachers-in-charge. There was one participating guidance counselor. A project coordinator supervised

and administered the entire program. Four school secretaries, one senior clerk, and one typist assisted with the maintenance of records, reports, requisitions, and payrolls.

Instructional materials were available and adequate at the large institutional sites. In most instances materials were identified and assembled for instruction in the specific skill areas. Each student had his own file of materials usually accompanied by a progress chart and log.

As a supplement to the instructional aspects of the program certain institutions had special programs which placed emphasis on the motivational qualities of reading and mathematics. Classes in manual and homemaking skills, laboratories in plant and animal life, speech therapy, educational field trips, and vocational counseling for teenagers were included to enhance the effectiveness of the program.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

A. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine if 70 percent of the program participants master at least two instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics which prior to participation in the program they did not master.

Using the results of the WRAT to determine grade levels, all participants were administered, as a pretest, selected appropriate criterion-referenced tests from the CROFT (Reading) and/or BASE (Mathematics) series to determine individual instructional objectives for each pupil. For instructional objectives diagnosed as requiring remediation (as determined by pretest failure), a posttest was administered during the last week of the program. For each instructional objective results of passing and failing on both the pre- and posttest were recorded on the Class Evaluation Record. For each instructional objective data were compiled on the number of participants passing and failing on both the pretest and posttest.

The data were analyzed to determine the percentage of participants demonstrating mastery and nonmastery of each instructional objective (according to the SED classification system) at initial and final testing. The percentage of students mastering two or more objectives each in reading and in mathematics was determined.

2. To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

The same methods and procedures were used to evaluate this objective as were used for the first objective, as stated above. The data were

analyzed and presented in tabular and narrative form to ascertain each of the following distributions:

The distribution of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by selected instructional objectives is shown in Table 1 (Reading) and Table 4 (Mathematics).

The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction is shown in Table 2 (Reading) and Table 5 (Mathematics).

The distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives is shown on Table 3 (Reading) and Table 6 (Mathematics).

3. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

B. OBSERVATION OF THE PROGRAM

The evaluation budget called for 14 half-day school visitations. All 10 of the large institutional sites were observed as well as eight of the group homes. They were located in the five boroughs of New York.

Overall, 546 students, 88 teachers, 12 paraprofessionals, and three student aides participated at the sites visited by the evaluator. Thus, the observed student population (546) was 88 percent of the total enrolled population of 624 pupils and 100 percent of the 540 pupils who completed the program. All of the participating staff were observed.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

The following presentation of findings is in accordance with the evaluation design specifications regarding the analysis of data relating to each of the objectives. The data indicated that there were 624 students enrolled during the course of the program. Due to the nature of the participating institutions there were students entering and being discharged throughout the summer. Overall, 84 pupils were discharged leaving 540 pupils who completed the program. In reading, 521 pupils enrolled, 67 were discharged, while 454 completed the program. In mathematics 388 pupils enrolled, 49 were discharged, while 339 completed the program. There was the same 13 percent discharged in all three categories. Thus all analyses of the reading component were based on the 454 pupils for whom there was complete data. Similarly, the math component data analyses were based on 339 pupils.

The first evaluation objective was:

> To determine if 70 percent of the program participants master at least two instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics which prior to the program they did not master.

This evaluation objective was achieved and surpassed. In reading, 75 percent of the pupils completing the program (N = 454) achieved mastery of at least two objectives as a result of participation in the program. In mathematics, 86 percent of the pupils completing the program (N = 339) mastered at least two objectives after instruction.

The second evaluation objective was:

To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrated mastery of instructional objectives.

Reading. The data for the reading component of the program are presented together.

As can be seen in Table 1 there were from 62 percent to 93 percent of the pupils who mastered each of the selected reading objectives as a result of participation in the program. The median percent of mastery was 79 percent. These data indicate the appropriateness of subtest selection for the majority of participants since there was a relatively high degree of mastery for so short a period of time.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY SELECTED READING INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION
(N = 454)

Instructional Objective	Ratio[a]	Percentage of Mastery
2101	55/ 60	92
2102	50/ 54	93
2104	69/ 78	88
2105	29/ 40	73
2106	88/105	84
2201	24/ 39	62
2403	78/110	71
2404	136/173	79
2406	144/211	68

[a] Ratio is $\frac{\text{number of pupils achieving mastery}}{\text{number of pupils attempting mastery}}$

This is even more evident when considering Table 2 which indicates that 75 percent of the participants not only attempted, but mastered, two or more objectives as a result of participation in the program. Only 8 percent of the students did not master any objectives. Examination of the Class Evaluation Records revealed notations of excessive absences for 85 percent of the students in this category.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF READING INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION
(N = 454)

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Mastery
9-10	0	0
7- 8	6	1
5- 6	13	3
3- 4	108	24
2	214	47
1	75	17
None	38	8

The proper implementation and effectiveness of the criterion-referenced test approach is underscored by the fact that 84 percent of all pupils mastered more than half of the objectives attempted, as shown in Table 3. It should also be noted that almost two-thirds (65 percent) of the participants mastered 90 to 100 percent of all the reading objectives attempted after instruction.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF READING INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES
(N = 454)

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils[a]
90-100	297	65
80- 89	8	1
70- 79	10	2
60- 69	31	7
50- 59	41	9
40- 49	7	2
30- 39	16	4
20- 29	2	b
10- 19	2	b
0- 9	40	9

[a]Totals 100 percent with two groups of less than 1 percent.

[b]Less than 1 percent.

Overall these data provided positive indicators of the effectiveness of the reading program.

Mathematics. The data for the mathematics component of the program will be presented and discussed together.

The effectiveness of the reading component is paralleled in mathematics. Table 4 indicates that there were from 67 to 92 percent of the

pupils who mastered each of the selected mathematics objectives. In other words a minimum of two-thirds of the students attempting an objective mastered it after instruction.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY SELECTED MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION (N = 339)

Instructional Objective	Ratio[a]	Percentage of Mastery
1101	96/108	89
1102	57/ 67	85
1103	135/184	73
1104	48/ 72	67
1105	24/ 33	73
1106	33/ 44	75
1107	102/111	92
1108	106/123	86
1109	120/156	77
1110	129/166	78

[a] Ratio is $\frac{\text{number of pupils achieving mastery}}{\text{number of pupils attempting mastery}}$

The effectiveness in exceeding the criterion level for the second evaluation objective was demonstrated in Table 5, which shows the distribution of the number of instructional objects mastered as a result of participation in the program. Eighty-six percent of the pupils mastered

at least two instructional objectives post-instruction. The largest proportion (52 percent) mastered from two to four objectives, with 34 percent mastering from five to 10 objectives. Five percent did not master any. These data clearly indicate that the mathematics component of the program exceeded the reading component in the number of objectives mastered.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION
(N = 339)

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
9-10	25	7
7- 8	25	7
5- 6	69	20
3- 4	88	26
2	87	26
1	29	9
None	16	5

It is curious to note that in mathematics (Table 6) as in reading (Table 3) 84 percent of all pupils mastered more than half of the objectives attempted.

Overall these data emphatically emphasize the expertness with which the program was developed and implemented. The criterion reference test method permitted for the identification of specific areas needing remedial instruction. Coupled with this diagnostic prescriptive approach, a staff

of experienced, highly competent, dedicated teachers delivered the remedial Title I services on an individualized one-to-one basis contributing to the effectiveness of mastery results.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES
(N = 339)

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
90-100	207	61
80- 89	10	3
70- 79	14	4
60- 69	32	9
50- 59	23	7
40- 49	9	3
30- 39	18	5
20- 29	2	1
10- 19	7	2
0- 9	17	5

The third evaluation objective was:

To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the Project Proposal.

The program was implemented as called for in the proposal with respect to dates of operation, staff, objectives, activities and materials, and serviced the needs of the population for which it was designed. There were two departures from the proposal. The first change was in the elimination of one site (Divine Providence) and the addition of

another (Spofford Juvenile Center). Secondly, the proposal called for approximately 556 pupils and the actual program had 624, an addition of 68 students. However, due to the transient nature of some of the institutions there were pupils leaving and entering during the course of the program. Overall, 13 percent (84 pupils) were discharged, leaving 540 pupils, or 97 percent of the targeted population to complete the program.

All staff members were observed during the on-site visits. In-depth interviews were conducted with the teachers-in-charge. Without exception, the program was staffed with an exceptionally committed, involved, competent, skilled group of professionals. Each person had had prior experience in the teaching of basic skills to institutionalized or some other form of special education populations. All staff members were familiar and experienced with the criterion referenced instructional approach. Almost all had taught at the same site in the regular school year program, or at a school in the community. Thus they knew both the pupils and the methodology of the program. While there were some criticisms of the record keeping system and application of the State Education Department's codification system, all were enthusiastic about the program and the participating pupils. As a group the staff demonstrated a concern with the general welfare of the pupils and a belief in the instructional strategy utilized.

Overall an extremely positive implicit statement about the value of the program was gleaned from the attitudes and efforts of the staff. It is believed that this sense of commitment and optimism emanated

from the leadership of the program. The program coordinator had year-round responsibility for the program and generated a sense of purpose and continuity. His dedication and enthusiasm served as a source of constant support and fostered a sense of comraderie among all participants, staff and pupils alike. This affirmative quality was further enhanced by the cooperation of the participating institutions.

The teachers in the group homes visited had special concerns. In many instances there was insufficient instructional material at each group home. Teachers sometimes had to bring materials from site to site themselves. Scheduling presented somewhat of a problem in homes where some of the pupils had jobs. Teachers wanted more flexibility in setting up schedules to accommodate more pupils. This did in fact occur at several group homes; teachers came at hours when the pupils were available. At one of the larger group home institutions, a plea for increased funds was made to enable more of the eligible, available pupils at group homes to be served in future programs of this nature.

This group home segment of the program was observed to be unique in the opportunities the program afforded the pupils for close one-to-one contact with the teacher. The students observed and interviewed appeared to be sincere in their attempts to improve their basic skills in reading and mathematics.

Previous evaluations have made four recommendations. They will each be cited and followed by a statement regarding their implementation.

1. The program should be recycled.

It was, although there were provisions for fewer numbers of

pupils in Summer 1976 than were previously served. This was a mandated budgetary reduction.

2. A diagnostic or criterion referenced test should be used to evaluate the program.

The program used the Croft CRT in reading and the Base CRT in mathematics.

3. Grade equivalent scores from survey achievement batteries, e.g., M.A.T., C.A.T., should be made available to teachers at the beginning of the program.

Wherever possible this was done. In instances where this information was not available pupils were administered the W.R.A.T. to obtain the instructional level.

4. A collection of resource materials should be established.

A central resource collection of instructional materials was established at one of the institutions as well as at the project coordinator's office. In addition, most institutions had their own appropriate materials. Nevertheless due to the geographic inconvenience of the resource center to many of the group home sites some problems persisted in this regard.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major evaluation objective of having 70 percent of the participants demonstrate mastery of at least two instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics which prior to the program they did not master was achieved and surpassed. In reading, 75 percent of the pupils (N = 454) achieved mastery of at least two objectives as a result of instruction. There were from 68 to 92 percent of the students who mastered each of the selected reading objectives. In mathematics, 86 percent of the pupils (N = 339) mastered at least two objectives as a result of instruction. There was a range of 67 to 92 percent of pupil mastery for each of the selected mathematics objectives. Sixty-eight percent of the pupils demonstrated mastery of more than 70 percent of the instructional objectives they attempted in both subject areas.

Program implementation was as proposed with the exception of having enrolled 68 more students than the proposed 556. However, due to the nature of some of the institutions there were pupils leaving and entering during the course of the program. Overall 13 percent (84 pupils) were discharged, leaving 540 pupils, or 97 percent of the original estimated population, to complete the program. In consideration of the program's strong positive effects it is recommended that it be recycled.

The following recommendations for strengthening the program were based on the findings and site observations:

1. The program should be expanded to service all eligible pupils in institutions, especially group homes, while maintaining at least the same teacher-pupil ratio.

2. Maintain the same staffing policies with respect to teacher recruitment.

Appendix A

Program Abstract

The Program for Institutionalized Children provided reading and/or mathematics instruction for 624 Title I eligible pupils in 12 institutions for neglected, abused, or delinquent children in grades one throuth twelve. The program operated for seven weeks with 15 hours of instruction weekly, with some variations. Small group instruction or individual tutoring was provided by 80 teachers assisted by 12 paraprofessionals, three student aides, under the supervision of eight teachers-in-charge. A project coordinator administered and supervised the entire program. All students were given entry and mastery tests with standardized criterion-referenced tests from the Croft reading system and/or from the Base mathematics system.

The major evaluation objective of having 70 percent of the participants demonstrate mastery of at least two instructional objectives in reading and/or mathematics which prior to the program they did not master was achieved and surpassed. In reading, 75 percent of the pupils (N = 454) achieved mastery of at least two objectives as a result of instruction. There were from 68 to 92 percent of the students who mastered each of the selected reading objectives. In mathematics, 86 percent of the pupils (N = 339) mastered at least two objectives as a result of instruction. There was a range of 67 to 92 percent of pupil mastery for each of the selected mathematics objectives. Sixty-eight percent of the pupils demonstrated mastery of more than 70 percent of the instructional objectives they attempted in both subject areas.

These highly positive results were attributed to a dedicated staff of teachers, almost all of whom had three or more years of experience in working with the same, or similar populations of children in these subject areas. Also, the criterion-referenced test approach has proved to be an effective instructional procedure.

Program implementation based upon 14 observation visits made adhered closely to that stated in the Program Proposal, with the exception of having enrolled 68 more students than the proposed 556. However, due to the nature of some of the institutions there were pupils leaving and entering during the course of the program. Overall 13 percent (84 pupils) were discharged, leaving 540 pupils, or 97 percent of the original estimated population, to complete the program. In consideration of the program's strong positive effects on the intended pupil population, it is recommended that it be recycled.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

September 4, 1976
Due Date: See Instructions

SED Project Number: 3 0 7 5 0 0 | 7 6 | 0 0 5 | S

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): 0 9 7 1 6 3 6 - 5 0

Project Title Program for Institutionalized Children

School District Name New York City Public Schools

School District Address Office of Special Education - District 75
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Audrey Herr

Title Consultant - Evaluator

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 796-3982

Date this form was completed Sept / 4 / 1976.

APPENDIX B

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECT

SECTION II Table 13: Criterion Referenced Test Results

Title I: B/E Function # 09-71636-50

Name of Program: Program for Institutionalized Children

D a t e: Summer 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60843	2101	McGuire-Bumpus: Croft Reading	P	10	46	44	2
	2102			6	22	21	1
	2104			8	35	32	3
	2105			2	15	12	3
	2106			0	25	23	2
	2201			8	6	6	0
	2403			1	2	1	1
	2404			0	6	5	1
	2406			1	5	3	2
60844	2101	Croft Reading	P	7	7	7	0
	2102			6	10	9	1

(See Continuation Sheets)

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)					N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
6	0	8	4	4	2	1	0	4	Croft Reading	P	12	11	9	2
					2	1	0	5			10	10	5	5
					2	1	0	6			7	24	19	5
					2	2	0	1			6	4	4	0
					2	4	0	3			8	16	12	4
					2	4	0	4			6	25	22	3
					2	4	0	6			5	33	27	6
6	0	8	4	5	2	1	0	1	Croft Reading	P	3	3	0	3
					2	1	0	2			3	11	9	2
					2	1	0	4			8	12	9	3
					2	1	0	5			8	10	6	4
					2	1	0	6			6	26	18	8
					2	2	0	1			19	1	1	0
					2	4	0	3			7	21	14	7

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60845	2404	Croft Reading	P	3	37	25	12
↓	2406	↓	↓	6	39	24	15
60846	2101	Croft Reading	P	1	2	2	0
↓	2102	↓	↓	0	2	2	0
	2104			0	1	1	0
	2105			0	0	0	0
	2106			0	12	12	0
	2201			0	0	0	0
	2403			0	4	2	2
	2404			2	26	18	8
↓	2406	↓	↓	0	23	14	9
60854	2101	Croft Reading	P	4	0	0	0
↓	2102	↓	↓	2	2	2	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)					N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
6	0	8	5	4	2	1	0	4	Croft Reading	P	0	4	3	1
					2	1	0	5			2	1	1	0
					2	1	0	6			2	0	0	0
					2	2	0	1			0	0	0	0
					2	4	0	3			0	0	0	0
					2	4	0	4			0	0	0	0
					2	4	0	6			0	0	0	0
6	0	8	5	5	2	1	0	1	Croft Reading	P	21	1	1	0
					2	1	0	2			19	4	4	0
					2	1	0	4			8	12	12	0
					2	1	0	5			20	1	1	0
					2	1	0	6			17	3	3	0
					2	2	0	1			0	13	8	5
					2	4	0	3			1	13	7	6

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60855	2404	Croft Reading	P	2	13	12	1
	2406	↓	↓	1	18	9	9
60856	2101	Croft Reading	P	4	0	0	0
	2102			4	0	0	0
	2104			4	0	0	0
	2105			4	0	0	0
	2106			4	0	0	0
	2201			0	4	2	2
	2403			8	10	9	1
	2404			4	13	10	3
	2406	↓	↓	9	8	3	5
60843	2101	Croft Reading	I	0	0	0	0
	2102	↓	↓	0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60843	2104	Croft Reading	I	0	0	0	0
	2105			0	0	0	0
	2106			0	0	0	0
	2201			0	3	3	0
	2403			0	0	0	0
	2404			0	0	0	0
	2406			0	1	1	0
60844	2101	Croft Reading	I	0	0	0	0
	2102			0	0	0	0
	2104			0	0	0	0
	2105			0	0	0	0
	2106			0	0	0	0
	2201			0	0	0	0
	2403			0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60844	2404	Croft Reading	I	0	0	0	0
	2406	↓	↓	0	0	0	0
60845	2101	Croft Reading	I	1	0	0	0
	2102			1	0	0	0
	2104			2	0	0	0
	2105			3	2	1	1
	2106			1	6	5	1
	2201			2	0	0	0
	2403			7	22	15	7
	2404			12	27	22	5
	2406	↓	↓	10	44	36	8
60846	2101	Croft Reading	I	0	1	1	0
	2102	↓	↓	1	2	2	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60846	2104	Croft Reading	I	0	2	2	0
	2105			0	1	1	0
	2106			0	5	5	0
	2201			0	1	0	1
	2403			13	13	9	4
	2404			12	14	11	3
	2406			5	22	14	8
60855	2101	Croft Reading	I	9	0	0	0
	2102			8	1	1	0
	2104			6	1	1	0
	2105			8	1	1	0
	2106			5	2	2	0
	2201			2	5	3	2
	2403			0	7	5	2

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60855	2403	Croft Reading	I	0	7	5	2
	2404			1	6	5	1
	2406			3	4	2	2
60850	2101	Croft Reading	I	3	0	0	0
	2102			3	0	0	0
	2104			2	0	0	0
	2105			2	1	1	0
	2106			2	1	1	0
	2201			2	1	0	1
	2403			0	4	4	0
	2404			0	4	3	1
	2406			2	2	2	0
		End of Reading					

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
		Media Research Associates:					
60943	1101	**Base Math**	1	3	4	4	0
	1101		2	11	0	0	0
	1101		3	4	0	0	0
	1102		1	4	0	0	0
	1102		2	9	2	2	0
	1102		3	4	0	0	0
	1103		1	2	5	5	0
	1103		2	11	0	0	0
	1103		3	4	0	0	0
	1104		1	1	0	0	0
	1104		2	11	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60943	1104	Base Math	3	4	0	0	0
	1105		1	2	0	0	0
	1105		2	11	0	0	0
	1105		3	4	0	0	0
	1106		1	2	0	0	0
	1106		2	11	0	0	0
	1106		3	4	0	0	0
	1107		1	1	5	4	1
	1107		2	11	0	0	0
	1107		3	4	0	0	0
	1108		1	2	4	4	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60943	1108	Base Math	2	10	1	1	0
	1108		3	4	0	0	0
	1109		1	0	3	2	1
	1109		2	9	2	2	0
	1109		3	4	0	0	0
	1110		1	1	1	1	0
	1110		2	10	1	1	0
	1110		3	4	0	0	0
60944	1101	Base Math	1	1	0	0	0
	1101		2	2	12	12	0
	1101		3	3	7	4	3
	1101		4	3	12	11	1

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60944	1101	Base Math	5	4	5	5	0
	1102		1	1	0	0	0
	1102		2	2	5	5	0
	1102		3	4	4	3	1
	1102		4	6	8	8	0
	1102		5	3	6	6	0
	1103		1	0	0	0	0
	1103		2	0	14	14	0
	1103		3	1	8	4	4
	1103		4	2	11	9	2
	1103		5	1	10	8	2
	1104		1	0	0	0	0

48

49

N. Y. S. E. D. - M. I. R. - Sect. II - Table 13 - C. R. T. Results (Continuation Sheet) Page 33

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60944	1104	Base Math	2	0	4	4	0
	1104		3	0	3	1	2
	1104		4	1	8	6	2
	1104		5	0	8	7	1
	1105		1	0	0	0	0
	1105		2	0	3	3	0
	1105		3	0	2	0	2
	1105		4	1	8	7	1
	1105		5	0	7	6	1
	1106		1	0	0	0	0
	1106		2	0	3	2	1
	1106		3	0	2	0	2
	1106		4	1	7	6	1

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60944	1106	Base Math	5	0	8	7	1
	1107		1	0	1	1	0
	1107		2	0	9	7	2
	1107		3	2	11	9	2
	1107		4	5	11	10	1
	1107		5	0	7	6	1
	1108		1	0	1	1	0
	1108		2	0	13	12	1
	1108		3	1	7	5	2
	1108		4	4	11	9	2
	1108		5	5	7	5	2
	1109		1	0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60944	1109	Base Math	2	0	4	3	1
	1109		3	0	9	4	5
	1109		4	0	15	11	4
	1109		5	3	8	4	4
	1110		1	0	0	0	0
	1110		2	0	4	3	1
	1110		3	0	4	1	3
	1110		4	0	14	10	4
	1110		5	0	8	4	4
60945	1101	Base Math	2	0	1	1	0
	1101		3	8	4	4	0
	1101		4	2	7	5	2
	1101		5	14	19	15	4

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60945	1101	Base Math	6	11	8	8	0
	1101		7	5	1	1	0
	1102		2	1	0	0	0
	1102		3	4	6	6	0
	1102		4	2	7	5	2
	1102		5	9	11	9	2
	1102		6	8	7	5	2
	1102		7	4	0	0	0
	1103		2	1	0	0	0
	1103		3	1	7	1	6
	1103		4	5	10	2	8
	1103		5	7	25	16	9
	1103		6	2	21	15	6

58

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60945	1103	Base Math	7	1	9	7	2
	1104		2	1	0	0	0
	1104		3	1	5	0	5
	1104		4	1	4	1	3
	1104		5	7	3	0	3
	1104		6	3	9	6	3
	1104		7	1	6	5	1
	1105		2	1	0	0	0
	1105		3	0	3	2	1
	1105		4	0	2	1	1
	1105		5	4	2	0	2
	1105		6	1	0	0	0

58

59

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60945	1105	Base Math	7	2	1	0	1
	1106		2	1	0	0	0
	1106		3	2	3	1	2
	1106		4	2	1	0	1
	1106		5	9	4	3	1
	1106		6	6	2	1	1
	1106		7	6	2	2	0
	1107		2	0	3	3	0
	1107		3	6	5	5	0
	1107		4	10	9	8	1
	1107		5	15	20	17	3
	1107		6	11	12	11	1
	1107		7	6	2	2	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60945	1108	Base Math	2	1	2	2	0
	1108		3	2	11	9	2
	1108		4	10	9	6	3
	1108		5	23	16	14	2
	1108		6	16	7	6	1
	1108		7	7	2	2	0
	1109		2	0	3	1	2
	1109		3	3	10	4	6
	1109		4	8	12	7	5
	1109		5	22	18	16	2
	1109		6	13	12	11	1
	1109		7	6	3	3	0
	1110		2	0	2	1	1

62

63

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60945	1110	Base Math	3	1	9	5	4
	1110		4	4	13	5	8
	1110		5	11	28	24	4
	1110		6	7	13	11	2
	1110		7	2	7	6	1
60946	1106	Base Math	2	0	0	0	0
	1101		3	0	0	0	0
	1101		4	3	4	2	2
	1101		5	5	3	3	0
	1101		6	9	0	0	0
	1101		7	7	0	0	0
	1101		8	1	0	0	0
	1101		9	1	0	0	0

64

65

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60946	1102	Base Math	2	0	0	0	0
	1102		3	0	1	1	0
	1102		4	1	2	0	2
	1102		5	3	2	1	1
	1102		6	7	2	2	0
	1102		7	7	4	4	0
	1102		8	1	0	0	0
	1102		9	0	0	0	0
	1103		2	0	1	1	0
	1103		3	0	1	0	1
	1103		4	2	5	3	2
	1103		5	1	9	8	1
	1103		6	2	6	4	2
	1103		7	5	11	9	2

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60946	1103	Base Math	8	0	4	4	0
	1103		9	1	2	2	0
	1104		2	0	0	0	0
	1104		3	0	1	0	1
	1104		4	0	1	0	1
	1104		5	0	2	1	1
	1104		6	3	1	1	0
	1104		7	3	8	7	1
	1104		8	0	3	3	0
	1104		9	1	1	1	0
	1105		2	0	0	0	0
	1105		3	0	0	0	0
	1105		4	0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60946	1105	Base Math	5	0	0	0	0
	1105		6	1	2	2	0
	1105		7	1	1	1	0
	1105		8	0	1	1	0
	1105		9	1	0	0	0
	1106		2	0	0	0	0
	1106		3	0	0	0	0
	1106		4	1	0	0	0
	1106		5	0	1	1	0
	1106		6	1	2	2	0
	1106		7	2	8	7	1
	1106		8	0	0	0	0
	1106		9	1	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60946	1107	Base Math	2	0	2	2	0
	1107		3	0	1	1	0
	1107		4	3	4	4	0
	1107		5	6	1	1	0
	1107		6	9	0	0	0
	1107		7	18	0	0	0
	1107		8	1	0	0	0
	1107		9	1	0	0	0
	1108		2	0	3	2	1
	1108		3	0	1	1	0
	1108		4	3	4	4	0
	1108		5	6	1	0	1
	1108		6	8	1	1	0
	1108		7	16	1	1	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60946	1108	Base Math	8	1	0	0	0
	1108		9	1	0	0	0
	1109		2	0	2	1	1
	1109		3	0	1	0	1
	1109		4	3	5	4	1
	1109		5	4	4	3	1
	1109		6	7	2	2	0
	1109		7	14	5	5	0
	1109		8	1	1	1	0
	1109		9	1	0	0	0
	1110		2	0	1	1	0
	1110		3	0	1	0	1
	1110		4	2	6	5	1

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60946	1110	Base Math	5	3	4	3	1
	1110		6	5	4	4	0
	1110		7	12	6	6	0
	1110		8	1	2	2	0
	1110		9	1	0	0	0
60955	1101	Base Math	2	0	1	1	0
	1101		3	3	3	3	0
	1101		4	5	5	5	0
	1101		5	6	6	6	0
	1101		6	3	1	1	0
	1102		2	1	0	0	0
	1102		3	5	0	0	0
	1102		4	9	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60955	1102	Base Math	5	11	0	0	0
	1102		6	4	0	0	0
	1103		2	0	1	1	0
	1103		3	3	2	2	0
	1103		4	7	2	2	0
	1103		5	1	9	7	2
	1103		6	2	2	2	0
	1104		2	1	0	0	0
	1104		3	5	0	0	0
	1104		4	9	0	0	0
	1104		5	11	0	0	0
	1104		6	2	2	2	0

78

79

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing	Failing	from Col.(2) Passing	from Col.(2) Failing
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60955	1105	Base Math	2	1	0	0	0
	1105		3	5	0	0	0
	1105		4	9	0	0	0
	1105		5	12	0	0	0
	1105		6	2	1	1	0
	1106		2	1	0	0	0
	1106		3	5	0	0	0
	1106		4	9	0	0	0
	1106		5	12	0	0	0
	1106		6	2	1	1	0
	1107		2	2	1	1	0
	1107		3	2	4	4	0
	1107		4	4	3	3	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60955	1107	Base Math	5	16	2	2	0
	1107		6	5	0	0	0
	1108		2	1	2	2	0
	1108		3	2	4	4	0
	1108		4	2	8	8	0
	1108		5	13	5	5	0
	1108		6	4	1	1	0
	1109		2	1	2	1	1
	1109		3	0	6	6	0
	1109		4	0	9	9	0
	1109		5	6	9	9	0
	1109		6	2	3	3	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60955	1110	Base Math	2	1	2	1	1
	1110		3	0	3	2	1
	1110		4	1	4	4	0
	1110		5	0	15	15	0
	1110		6	0	5	5	0
60956	1101	Base Math	4	3	0	0	0
	1101		5	1	3	3	0
	1101		6	0	2	2	0
	1101		7	0	0	0	0
	1102		4	0	0	0	0
	1102		5	4	0	0	0
	1102		6	4	0	0	0
	1102		7	0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S.1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Passing (3)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60956	1103	Base Math	4	0	2	2	0
	1103		5	1	3	3	0
	1103		6	2	2	2	0
	1103		7	4	2	2	0
	1104		4	0	0	0	0
	1104		5	4	0	0	0
	1104		6	2	1	1	0
	1104		7	4	2	2	0
	1105		4	0	0	0	0
	1105		5	4	0	0	0
	1105		6	4	0	0	0
	1105		7	0	0	0	0

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60956	1106	Base Math	4	0	0	0	0
	1106		5	4	0	0	0
	1106		6	4	0	0	0
	1106		7	0	0	0	0
	1107		4	3	0	0	0
	1107		5	4	1	1	0
	1107		6	6	0	0	0
	1107		7	6	0	0	0
	1108		4	3	0	0	0
	1108		5	4	1	1	0
	1108		6	7	0	0	0
	1108		7	6	0	0	0

N. Y. S. E. D. - M. I. R. - Sect. II - Table 13 - C. R. T. Results (Continuation Sheet) Page 53

Name of Progr.: Program for Institutionalized Children NYC B/E Function # 09-71636-50 S.S. 1976

Component Code (Handicap Code 00)	N. Y. S. Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	from Col.(2) Passing (3)	from Col.(2) Failing (4)
60956	1109	Base Math	4	2	1	1	0
	1109		5	1	4	4	0
	1109		6	1	3	3	0
	1109		7	6	0	0	0
	1110		4	0	3	2	1
	1110		5	1	4	4	0
	1110		6	1	3	3	0
	1110		7	6	0	0	0
		End of Math					

APPENDIX C

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to NARRATIVE)

Function # 09-21636-50

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed	
						N	%		Number
6 0 8 43 0 0	7 2 0	43	Croft 72	39	88	1	1	Discharged	1
6 0 8 44 0 0	7 2 0	44		98	90	8	8	Discharged	8
6 0 8 45 0 0	7 2 0	45		179	155	24	13	Discharged	24
6 0 8 46 0 0	7 2 0	46		80	62	18	23	Discharged	18
6 0 8 54 0 0	7 2 0	54		4	4	0	0		
6 0 8 55 0 0	7 2 0	55		50	39	11	22	Discharged	11
6 0 8 56 0 0	7 2 0	56		21	16	5	24	Discharged	5
6 0 9 4 30 0	7 2 0	43	Base Math	34	32	2	6	Discharged	2
6 0 9 4 40 0	7 2 0	44		64	61	3	5	Discharged	3

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.)
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.
(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to NARRATIVE) Function # 09-71636-50

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed	
						N	%		Number
6 0 9 4 5 0 0	7 2 0	45	Base Math	149	128	21	14	Discharged	21
6 0 9 4 6 0 0	7 2 0	46		76	62	14	18	Discharged	14
6 0 9 5 5 0 0	7 2 0	55		46	43	3	7	Discharged	3
6 0 9 5 6 0 0	7 2 0	56		19	13	6	32	Discharged	6

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.)
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.
(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.